

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on June 18, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 15, 16, 18-20, 24-26, 28, 29, and 31-34 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-35 remain pending in this application.

\$102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 12-18 & 20-24 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mueller. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from that which is disclosed in Mueller. Applicant does not concede to he arguments set forth in the June 18, 2003 Office Action. However, Applicants view those arguments as moot in light of the clarifying amendments. Mueller does not disclose the limitations of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 1-4, 6-8, 12-18 & 20-24 are in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 25-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by IEEE 1164. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from that which is disclosed in IEEE 1164. Applicant does not concede to he arguments set forth in the June 18, 2003 Office Action. However, Applicants view those arguments as moot in light of the clarifying amendments. IEEE 1164 does not disclose the limitations of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 25-27 are in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

\$103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 5, 9-11 & 19 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller in view of IEEE 1164 and further in view of Ralston. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from that which is disclosed in Mueller in view of IEEE 1164 and further in view of Ralston. Applicant does not concede to he arguments set forth in the June 18, 2003 Office Action. However, Applicants view those arguments as moot in light of the clarifying amendments. The combination of these references neither discloses,

suggests nor motivates the limitations of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 5, 9-11 & 19 are in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 7 & 29-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tzartzanis in view of De Micheli. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from that which is disclosed in Tzartzanis in view of De Micheli. Applicant does not concede to the arguments set forth in the June 18, 2003 Office Action. However, Applicants view those arguments as moot in light of the clarifying amendments. The combination of these references neither discloses, suggests nor motivates the limitations of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 1-5, 7 & 29-30 are in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 6, 8, 12-14 & 19 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tzartzanis in view of Mueller. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from that which is disclosed in Tzartzanis in view of Mueller. Applicant does not concede to the arguments set forth in the June 18, 2003 Office Action. However, Applicants view those arguments as moot in light of the clarifying amendments. The combination of these references neither discloses, suggests nor motivates the limitations of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 6, 8, 12-14 & 19 are in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 15-18, 20-28 & 33-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tzartzanis in view of De Micheli and further in view of Mueller. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from that which is disclosed in Tzartzanis in view of De Micheli and further in view of Mueller. Applicant does not concede to the arguments set forth in the June 18, 2003 Office Action. However, Applicants view those arguments as moot in light of the clarifying amendments. The combination of these references neither discloses, suggests nor motivates the limitations of Applicant's claims. Accordingly,

Applicant believes that claims 15-18, 20-28 & 33-35 are in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller in view of in view of Tzartzanis and further in view of Ralston. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from that which is disclosed in Mueller in view of in view of Tzartzanis and further in view of Ralston. Applicant does not concede to he arguments set forth in the June 18, 2003 Office Action. However, Applicants view those arguments as moot in light of the clarifying amendments. The combination of these references neither discloses, suggests nor motivates the limitations of Applicant's claim. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 31 is in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tzartzanis in view of De Micheli and further in view of Ralston. Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from that which is disclosed in Tzartzanis in view of De Micheli and further in view of Ralston. Applicant does not concede to he arguments set forth in the June 18, 2003 Office Action. However, Applicants view those arguments as moot in light of the clarifying amendments. The combination of these references neither discloses, suggests nor motivates the limitations of Applicant's claim. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 32 is in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Sherry Schumm, at (480) 657-3767 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

BOHR-WINN SHIH ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6904

Date

Aug 18, 2003

By

Daniel J. Kluth
Daniel J. Kluth
Reg. No. 32,146

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O.Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 18 day of August, 2003

Name

Tina Kohout

Signature

[Signature]